BY08 - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)

INITIATIVE DEFINITION BY08

Initiative Definition BY08

Template Name	IT Investment BY2008
Investment Name	BY08 - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)
Investment Revision Number	5
Is this investment a consolidated business case?	No
Point of Contact	Jones, Quentin
Revision Comment	
Class	IT

I.A: OVERVIEW BY08

Descriptive Information BY08

Date of Submission	9/11/2006
Agency	Environmental Protection Agency
Bureau	Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substan
Name of this Capital Asset	BY08 - Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)
Full UPI Code	020-00-01-14-01-1030-00
Four Digit UPI Code	1030
Two Digit UPI Code	00
Exhibit 53 Part	IT Investments by Mission Area
OMB Investment Type	01 - Major Investment
OMB Exhibit 53 Major Mission Area	Goal 4 - Healthy Communities and Ecosystem
PY Full UPI Code	020-00-01-14-01-1030-00-108-023
What kind of investment will this be in this Budget Year?	Full Acquisition
If this investment supports homeland security, Indicate by corresponding number which homeland security mission area(s) this investment supports?	Emergency Preparedness and Response
OMB Short Description	PRISM's primary purpose is to provide e-government capabilities to share pesticide information with OPP stakeholders. PRISM will also support OPP's responsibilities under Registration Review and the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA).
Investment C&A Status	00 - Systems within this investment have not been through the C&A process because the investment is not yet operational

Screening Questions BY08

What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2006

Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing the Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM) investment to more efficiently enable EPA's mission to "protect human health and the environment". This investment will also effectively contribute towards EPA's Strategic Goal "To promote healthy communities and ecosystems" by providing a single automated portal for all pesticide related data, communications, registrations and transactions. In order to accomplish this, EPA must bring together a variety of programs, tools, approaches and resources. Currently, the EPA's mission is being supported by the Office of Pesticide Programs Information Network (OPPIN), a group of stand alone, legacy applications that lack the functionality and convenience needed by EPA and its State government and environmental customers. The Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) has migrated all of its major data systems including regulatory and scientific data, workflow tracking and electronic document management into OPPIN. The purpose of OPPIN was to decrease data entry burden, increase analytical capabilities by having improved access to data, better track decision- making processes, prevent loss of and improve access to critical decision documents, and make OPP information readily available to those both within and outside of the program. Unfortunately, many flaws have been identified in OPPIN that require correction. These flaws include: 1) a lack of data integrity, 2) poor database design, and 3) a variety of system problems which impact the system's usability. These functional and service delivery limitations reduce

EPA's ability to deliver the right information to the right people at the right time, and therefore best serve EPA's customers. EPA FTE support will be a major component of the planning, development, implementation and sustainment of this investment. PRISM FTE support comprises approximately 20% of total spending for this project and will continue to be a major enabling contributor throughout the project lifecycle. The PRISM investment is a fundamental component of EPA's Enterprise Architecture in providing critical informational support to OPP through an integrated and technologically sound environment. PRISM's key goal is provide EPA personnel with a technology environment that is secure, that will ensure easy access to information that is accurate and timely, and will be available to the right customer, with the right information, and in a clear format.

Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	5/11/2006
Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
Contact information of Project Manager?	
Project Manager Name Jones, Quentin	
Project Manager Phone Number	703-308-0097
Project Manager E-mail	jones.quentin@epa.gov
Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	Yes
Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes
Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all of the PMA initiatives that apply:	Expanded E-Government, Human Capital
Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)	Yes
Does this investment address a weakness found during the PART Review?	No
If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	
If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	
Is this investment for information technology?	Yes
Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	Strategic Management of Human Capital -PRISM is an information technology system designed to capture the knowledge of existing employees. Much of the day to day decision making has not been effectively captured in any electronic system prior to PRISM. Expanded Electronic Government - This project directly supports the PMA through Expanded Electronic Government by web enabling and automating data collection, information sharing, information dissemination and reporting.

IT Screening Questions BY08

If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section.	
What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 2
What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance):	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk"	No

memo)?

Is this a financial management system?	No
If "yes", does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	
If "yes," which FFMIA compliance area?	
If "no," what does it address?	
If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52	
Provide the Percentage Financial Management for the budget year	0
What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	100
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for hardware?	13
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for software?	5
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for services?	62
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for other services?	20
If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?	N/A
Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:	
Privacy Officer Name Hutt, Judy	
Privacy Officer Phone Number	202-566-1668
Privacy Officer Title	Agency Privacy Act Officer
Privacy Officer E-mail	hutt.judy@epa.gov
Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	Yes

I.B: SUMMARY OF SPENDING BY08

Summary of Spending BY08

Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT STAGES   * Costs in thousands

	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
Planning									
Budgetary Resources	0	925	425	175	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	925	425	175	0	0	0	0	
Preliminary Design									
Budgetary Resources	0	925	425	175	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	925	425	175	0	0	0	0	
Contract Services									

Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	0	5047	6250	5975	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	5047	6250	5975	0	0	0	0	
Development									
Budgetary Resources	0	5047	6250	5975	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	5047	6250	5975	0	0	0	0	
Government FTE									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Infrastructure Expenses									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	0	5972	6675	6150	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	5972	6675	6150	0	0	0	0	
Operations & Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL									
Budgetary Resources	0	5972	6675	6150	0	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	5972	6675	6150	0	0	0	0	
Government FTE Costs									
Budgetary Resources	67	1050	1080	1820	0	0	0	0	
Planning									
Budgetary Resources	67	630	432	364	0	0	0	0	
Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	0	420	648	1456	0	0	0	0	
Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

Full Time Equivalents BY08
Use the following table to provide the number of Government Full Time Equivalents (FTE) represented by the Government FTE Costs in the Summary of Spending Table. Numbers should be entered in decimal format for each of the categories listed.

FTE Table

	PY - 6 2000	PY - 5 2001	PY - 4 2002	PY - 3 2003	PY - 2 2004	PY - 1 2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 2012	BY + 5 2013	BY + 6 2014	BY + 7 2015	BY + 8 2016	Total
Financial Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Management																	
IT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	8.1	8.3	14.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total*	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	8.1	8.3	14.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

*This row represents the 'Number of FTE represented by cost' from Summary of Spending table and will be sent to OMB.

Funding Questions BY08

Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?	No
How many and in what year?	
If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.	
Funds in the maintenance and operation role for FY 2006 and 2007 have been moved into the acquisition role for those years because of a correction in the classification of the funded activities.	
Provide the Percent Budget Formulation (BF) for the budget year	0
Provide the Percent Budget Execution (BE) for the budget year	0

Funding Sources BY08

Funding Sources   * Costs in thousands

FS Name: MAX Code	Row Type	PY - 6 2000	PY - 5 2001	PY - 4 2002	PY - 3 2003	PY - 2 2004	PY - 1 2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 2012	BY + 5 2013	BY + 6 2014	BY + 7 2015	BY + 8 2016	Total
Total Yearly Budgets	DME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

I.C: ACQUISITION/CONTRACT STRATEGY BY08

Contract/Task Order Table BY08

Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Contract/Task Orders Table

Row Number	Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded?	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order	Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	Is it performance based?	Competitively awarded?	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	Is EVM in the contract?	Does the contract include the required security and privacy clauses?	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?
2	EP05D001234	FFP	Yes	9/30/2005	10/1/2005	9/30/2006	480	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Nolte, Kami	202-564-6652 / nolte.kami@epa.gov	Level 3	
3	EP05D000229	FFP	Yes	5/11/2006	5/11/2006	5/11/2007	175	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Nolte, Kami	202-564-6652 / nolte.kami@epa.gov	Level 3	
4	EP06D000414	CPAF	Yes	5/11/2006	5/11/2006	10/11/2006	900	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes	Nolte, Kami	202-564-6652 / nolte.kami@epa.gov	Level 3	

Contract/Task Order Questions BY08

If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:	
Earned Value reporting will be a requirement of all contracts awarded under PRISM.	
Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
Explain why (508 Compliance)?	Section 508 standards are included in all EPA statements of work. EPA systems must demonstrate successful compliance with section 508 requirements before they are submitted to the EPA Maintenance Review Board. The EPA Enterprise Architect chairs the change control board and has the unique authority to reject systems that do not comply with the EPA Enterprise Architecture and standards.
Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
What is the date of your acquisition plan?	10/30/2005
If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
If "no," briefly explain why:	

I.D: PERFORMANCE INFORMATION BY08

Performance Goals & Measures BY08

Agencies must use the Performance Goals and Measures Table below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Performance Goals and Measures

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)

FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM) BY08

FEA PRM

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2006		Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Increase percentage of Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically through a reduction in the reliance upon manual counts to measure the # of tolerances related to pesticides registrants & the reduction of risks to the public.	80.4% total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	87.7% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD
2006		Mission and	Environmental	Environmental	Increase the	Greater than	Greater than	TBD

		Business Results	Management	Remediation	number of screened commercial and/or industrial chemicals in the U.S. inventory in order to prevent or reduce chemical risks.	23% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	50% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed	
2006		Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	% of OPP data reviewed and validated through system integration and standardization to ensure that incoming data is consistent (LUIS, TESS, CDX, Workflow)	75% of OPP data has been reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform	85% of OPP data reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD
2006		Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase percentage of documents managed within a document management system.	0% of OPP documents are managed in a document management environment.	50% of OPP documents are managed in a document management environment. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD
2007		Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Increase percentage of Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically through reduction in the reliance upon manual counts to measure the number of tolerances related to pesticides registrants and the reduction of risks to the public.	87.7% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically.	91.2% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD
2007		Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Remediation	Increase the number of screened commercial and/or industrial chemicals in the U.S. inventory in	Greater than 50% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed.	Greater than 70% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed.	TBD

					order to prevent or reduce chemical risks.			
2007		Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	% of OPP data reviewed and validated through system integration and standardization to ensure that incoming data is consistent (LUIS, TESS, CDX, Workflow	85% of OPP data has been reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform.	90% of OPP data reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM platform. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD
2007		Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Increase percentage of documents managed within a document management system.	50% of OPP documents are managed in a document management environment.	70% of OPP documents are managed in a document management environment. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD
2008		Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Increase percentage of Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically through reduction in the reliance upon manual counts to measure the number of tolerances related to pesticides registrants and the reduction of risks to the public.	91.2% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically	94.2% of total Tolerance Reassessments performed electronically. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD
2008		Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Remediation	Increase the number of screened commercial and/or industrial chemicals in the U.S. inventory in order to prevent or reduce chemical risks.	Greater than 70% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed.	Greater than 90% of the 82,000 chemicals reviewed.	TBD
2008		Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	% of OPP data reviewed and validated through system	90% of OPP data has been reviewed and validated for integration	92% of OPP data reviewed and validated for integration into the PRISM	TBD

					integration and standardization to ensure that incoming data is consistent (LUIS, TESS, CDX, Workflow)	into the PRISM platform	platform. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	
2008		Technology	Information and Data	Internal Data Sharing	Increase percentage of documents managed within a document management system.	70% of OPP documents are managed in a document management environment.	80% of OPP documents are managed in a document management environment. This improvement supports Goal 4, Objective 1.	TBD

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding ""Measurement Area"" and ""Measurement Grouping"" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

I.E: SECURITY AND PRIVACY BY08

Costs & Risks BY08

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?   Yes

Provide the Percentage IT Security for the budget year   13

Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.   Yes

Security: Planning Systems BY08

Systems in Planning - Security

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date
PRISM	Government Only		

Security: Operational Systems BY08

Operational Systems - Security

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested

Security: Weaknesses & Contractor Procedures BY08

Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?	No
If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?	
Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?	No
If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.	
How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?	

Privacy: Planning & Operational Systems BY08

Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?
Pesticide Registration Information System	Yes	Yes.	Yes.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

I.F: ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE (EA) BY08

General EA Questions BY08

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.	
Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	Yes
If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	
Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	Yes
If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	Pesticide Registration Information System (PRISM)
If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	

FEA SRM BY08

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
PRISM's Systems Management	PRISM will redefine EPA's capabilities that support the organization of pesticide data from separate data sources into a single source using new applicationa that will allow for the integration and the modification of current and new system data models to capture new and comprehensive pesticide information within a single system.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	0
PRISM's Web Portal Development and Interface	PRISM will define the set of capabilities that support the redesigning of disparate pesticide information systems into one system that uses a common set of data structures and rules.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	10
PRISM's Management of Process	PRISM will define and coordinate the hardware and software of systems that contain or record pesticide data to ensure compatibility and accessibility of the data to professionals and citizens.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	5

PRISM's Relationship Management	PRISM will provide a framework to promote the effective collaboration between EPA and its business partners, particularly members of the pesticide distribution chain (e.g. Channel and alliance partners, resellers, agents, brokers, and dealers) and other third parties that are involved with pesticides. PRISM will also allow citizens to access a single portal with data on pesticides and their possible impact on human health and the environment or ecosystems.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Partner Relationship Management			No Reuse	50
PRISM's Content Management and Maintenance	PRISM will increase EPA's capabilities to manage the storage, maintenance and retrieval of pesticide related documents and information both internally and through EPA's website.	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Review and Approval			No Reuse	25
PRISM's Imaging Management	PRISM will redefine the set of capabilities that support the scanning of physical pesticide related documents for use	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR			No Reuse	10

	electronically in its systems and for those available to the citizen at EPA's web site.							
PRISM's Customer Help Desk Management	Receive and track user-reported issues and problems with client or citizen use and access tp pesticide data while using PRISM including help desk calls.	Support Services	Systems Management	Issue Tracking			No Reuse	0

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

FEA TRM BY08

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Enterprise Application Integration	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Content Review and Approval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Issue Tracking	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Partner Relationship Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	

Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

Reuse & Information Sharing BY08

Will the application leverage existing components and/or No

applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?	
If "yes," please describe how the application will leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government.	
Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?	No
If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?	
If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).	

FEA Primary Mapping BY08

FEA Primary Mapping
Reference Model:	BRM
Business Area:	Services For Citizens
Line of Business:	Environmental Management
Sub Function:	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting
Mapping Code:	108023

II.A: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS BY08

Analysis Background BY08

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A- 94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?	6/30/2005
If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

Alternatives Table BY08

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternatives Analysis Results

Send to OMB	Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
True	1 -Component-Based architecture development			
True	2 - Limited development			
True	3- COTS Replacement			

Selected Alternative BY08

Which alternative was selected by the Initiative Governance process and why was it chosen?

Alternative 1 - Component based architecture development was selected because it provides the greatest overall contribution to fulfilling the EPA mission. EPA considered the following criteria (technical, financial, and strategic) when deciding whether to undertake the PRISM investment. The PRISM investment selection process include criteria related to the quantitatively expressed projected net, risk-adjusted return on investment, and specific quantitative and qualitative criteria such as Earned Value, ROI, and Net Present Value Analysis for comparing and prioritizing the alternative investments. Technically, the selected alternative provides the following application advantages: integrates legacy

applications currently missing from OPPIN; eliminates existing stand-alone, isolated pesticide-related applications; improves OPPIN data quality by developing automated data collection mechanisms; creates a web-enabled, customizable, information analysis portal, whereby EPA personnel can better support the mission to "promote healthy communities and ensures that all pesticide system interfaces communicate effectively with other EPA systems and ecosystems". Most importantly, during incremental development and integration this option ensures that EPA OPP operations will not be interrupted while integrating continues improvements to the pesticide systems. Financially, PRISM will reduce this burden through process automation to 2400 hours annually. This will result in a lifecycle cost savings of $4.5M Reduction in downtime of the pesticide system(s) will result in a lifecycle cost savings of $2.0M. Strategically, the selected alternative will support e-government by providing a single source portal for pesticide registrant data and combines elements of core critical data, based on all OPP and EPA requirements. In addition, this solution is also the only alternative that is consistent with the EPA architecture to provide accessible, secure, responsive, accurate systems, and shared information to support EPA employees and our partnering federal, state and local federal agencies. Additionally, the investment enables EPA to minimize the risks associated with maintaining older systems that don't support existing functionality.

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?
- Maintenance Cost Avoidance: PRISM will replace and integrate all OPPIN applications, which require high levels of spending for adaptive, corrective and perfective maintenance. - Savings in worker hours resulting from automation of manual processes: PRISM will reduce the # of man hours required to fulfill agency pesticide reporting requirements from an average of 12,000 hours annually for OPPIN to an anticipated 2,400 hours annually for PRISM, resulting in a lifecycle cost savings of $4.5M. - Reduction in System Downtime: The current inventory of OPPIN legacy applications have experienced an unacceptable level of user downtime as a result of ongoing maintenance upgrades, user help desk trouble tickets and EPA lost work hours. This level of system downtime directly affects customer satisfaction levels. The PRISM investment will dramatically reduce the need for maintenance upgrades and will lower the number of monthly help desk tickets, resulting in higher levels of customer and user efficiency and satisfaction. This will result in a lifecycle cost savings of $2.0M. - Workflow and Process Automation: The creation of the PRISM investment will directly result in increased productivity of OPP work staff through improved workflow processes and manual process automation. A benefit of PRISM's improved workflow and process automation will be evident through improved data entry accuracy, resulting in fewer errors in analysis and service response to both EPA and the community(Lifecycle savings $1,000,000).
- Workload Capacity Enhancement: The automation of manual process will increase EPA's capacity to handle concurrent information and sudden surges in workload (Lifecycle savings $1,000,000). -Integration of systems: The processing efficiencies resulting from the change from a client server based system to PRISM will result in improved consistency across all applications resulting in simplified registration processes and access to registration results (Lifecycle savings $1,000,000). -Benefits to states and citizens: Lifecycle savings $1,000,000

II.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08
You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
What is the date of the risk management plan?	12/30/2006
Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No

If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:

If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed?
If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan?
If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

Investment Risks BY08
Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

II.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Earned Value BY08
Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748?   Yes

Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

What is the Planned Value (PV)?

What is the Earned Value (EV)?	
What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?	
What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government
EVMS "As of" date:	6/30/2006
What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)?	
What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?	
What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?	
What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)?	

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

Answer the following questions about the status of this investment. Include information on all appropriate capital assets supporting this investment except for assets in which the performance information is reported in a separate exhibit 300.

Cost/Schedule Variance BY08

Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)	No
If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?	
If "yes," explain the variance:	
If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?	
What is the most current "Estimate at Completion"?	

Performance Baseline BY08

Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?	Yes

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in $ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate 0 for any milestone no longer active.

If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?	08/31/2006

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline Planned Completion Date	Initial Baseline Total Cost (Estimated)	Current Baseline Completion Date Planned	Current Baseline Completion Date Actual	Current Baseline Total Cost Planned	Current Baseline Total Cost Actual	Current Baseline Variance Schedule (# days)	Current Baseline Variance Cost	Percent Complete
5.1	FTE Costs FY05	09/30/2005	$0.067	09/30/2005	09/30/2005	$0.067	$0.067	0	$0.000	100%
6.1	Planning	12/30/2006	$0.925	04/01/2006		$0.925				95%
6.2	Requirements Analysis and Preliminary Design	12/30/2006	$0.925	12/30/2006		$0.925				%
6.3	Acquisition of Hardware and Support Services	09/30/2006	$0.570	09/30/2006		$0.570				%
6.4	Software Design & Development	09/30/2006	$2.677	09/30/2006		$2.677				%
6.5	Security Planning and Accreditation	09/30/2006	$0.675	09/30/2006		$0.675				%
6.6	PRISM Business Processes Development	09/30/2006	$0.200	09/30/2006		$0.200				%
6.7	FTE Costs FY06	09/29/2006	$0.715	09/29/2006		$1.050				%

7.1	Planning	11/01/2007	$0.425	11/01/2007		$0.425				%
7.2	Preliminary Design and Analysis	12/30/2006	$0.425	12/30/2006		$0.425				%
7.3	Acquisition of Hardware	09/30/2007	$0.550	09/30/2007		$0.550				%
7.4	Software Design and Development	01/02/2008	$3.975	01/02/2008		$3.975				%
7.5	Security & Document Preparation	09/30/2007	$0.700	09/30/2007		$0.700				%
7.6	PRISM Business Processes Development	09/30/2007	$0.600	09/30/2007		$0.600				%
7.7	FTE Costs FY07	09/28/2007	$1.080	09/28/2007		$1.080				%
8.1	Planning	04/01/2008	$0.175	04/01/2008		$0.175				%
8.2	Preliminary Design and Analysis	06/01/2007	$0.175	06/01/2007		$0.175				%
8.3	Acquisition of Hardware and Support Software	09/30/2008	$0.350	09/30/2008		$0.350				%
8.4	Software Design and Development	09/30/2008	$3.150	09/30/2008		$3.150				%
8.5	Security-Accreditation Preparation	09/30/2008	$0.500	09/30/2008		$0.500				%
8.6	PRISM Business Processes Development	09/30/2008	$1.800	09/30/2008		$1.800				%
8.7	FTE Costs FY08	09/30/2008	$1.820	09/30/2006		$1.820				%
9.1										%
9.2										%
9.3										%
9.4										%
9.5										%
9.6										%
9.7										%
10.1										%
10.2										%
10.3										%
Project Totals										

III.A: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
What is the date of the risk management plan?	12/30/2006
Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No
If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:	
If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed?	
If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan?	
If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?	

III.B: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Operational Analysis BY08

Was operational analysis conducted?	No
If "yes," provide the date the operational analysis was completed.	
Please provide a brief summary of the operational analysis results.	
If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:	

Performance Baseline BY08

Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts.

What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date	Total Cost	Completion Date	Total Cost	Schedule (# days)	Cost
Project Totals							

IV.A: E-GOV AND LINES OF BUSINESS OVERSIGHT BY08

Partners BY08

Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative or a Line of Business(LOB), i.e., selected the "E-Gov and LOB Oversight" choice in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as "E-Gov and LOB Oversight" will complete only Parts I and IV of the exhibit 300.

Multi-agency initiatives, such as E-Gov and LOB initiatives, should develop a joint exhibit 300.

As a joint exhibit 300, please identify the agency stakeholders. Provide the partner agency and partner agency approval date for this joint exhibit 300.

Stakeholder Table

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Joint Exhibit Approval Date

Partnering Strategies BY08

Provide the partnering strategies you are implementing with the participating agencies and organizations. Identify all partner agency capital assets supporting the common solution; Managing Partner capital assets should also be included in this joint exhibit 300. These capital assets should be included in the Summary of Spending table of Part I, Section B. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53)

Partner Capital Assets within this Investment

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Partner Agency Asset Title	Partner Agency Exhibit 53 UPI (BY2008)

Partner Funding BY08

For jointly funded initiative activities, provide in the "Partner Funding Strategies Table": the name(s) of partner agencies; the UPI of the partner agency investments; and the partner agency contributions for CY and BY. Please indicate partner contribution amounts (in-kind contributions should also be included in this amount) and fee-for-service amounts. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53. For non-IT fee-for-service amounts the Partner exhibit 53 UPI can be left blank)

Partner Funding Strategies

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY2008)	CY Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service

Analysis Background BY08

An Alternatives Analysis for E-Gov and LOB initiatives should also be obtained. At least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline (i.e., the status quo), should be included in the joint exhibit 300. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?	6/30/2005
If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

Alternatives Table BY08

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternatives Analysis Results

Send to OMB	Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
True	1 -Component-Based architecture development			
True	2 - Limited development			
True	3- COTS Replacement			

Selected Alternative BY08

Which alternative was selected by the Initiative Governance process and why was it chosen?

Alternative 1 - Component based architecture development was selected because it provides the greatest overall contribution to fulfilling the EPA mission. EPA considered the following criteria (technical, financial, and strategic) when deciding whether to undertake the PRISM investment. The PRISM investment selection process include criteria related to the quantitatively expressed projected net, risk-adjusted return on investment, and specific quantitative and qualitative criteria such as Earned Value, ROI, and Net Present Value Analysis for comparing and prioritizing the alternative investments. Technically, the selected alternative provides the following application advantages: integrates legacy applications currently missing from OPPIN; eliminates existing stand-alone, isolated pesticide-related applications; improves OPPIN data quality by developing automated data collection mechanisms; creates a web-enabled, customizable, information analysis portal, whereby EPA personnel can better support the mission to "promote healthy communities and ensures that all pesticide system interfaces communicate effectively with other EPA systems and ecosystems". Most importantly, during incremental development and integration this option ensures that EPA OPP operations will not be interrupted while integrating continues improvements to the pesticide systems. Financially, PRISM will reduce this burden through process automation to 2400 hours annually. This will result in a lifecycle cost savings of $4.5M Reduction in downtime of the pesticide system(s) will result in a lifecycle cost savings of $2.0M. It is anticipated that the PRISM investment will result in a total life-cycle savings of approximately $24M. Strategically, the selected alternative will support e-government by providing a single source portal for pesticide registrant data and combines elements of core critical data, based on all OPP and EPA requirements. In addition, this solution is also the only alternative that is consistent with the EPA architecture to provide accessible, secure, responsive, accurate systems, and shared information to support EPA employees and our partnering federal, state and local federal agencies. Additionally, the investment enables EPA to minimize the risks associated with maintaining older systems that don't support existing functionality.

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

- Maintenance Cost Avoidance: PRISM will replace and integrate all OPPIN applications, which require high levels of spending for adaptive, corrective and perfective maintenace. - Savings in worker hours resulting from automation of manual processes: PRISM will reduce the # of man hours required to fulfill agency pesticide reporting requirements from an average of 12,000 hours annually for OPPIN to an anticipated 2,400 hours annually for PRISM, resulting in a lifecycle cost savings of $4.5M. - Reduction in System

Downtime: The current inventory of OPPIN legacy applications have experienced an unacceptable level of user downtime as a result of ongoing maintenance upgrades, user help desk trouble tickets and EPA lost work hours. This level of system downtime directly affects customer satisfaction levels. The PRISM investment will dramatically reduce the need for maintenance upgrades and will lower the number of monthly help desk tickets, resulting in higher levels of customer and user efficiency and satisfaction. This will result in a lifecycle cost savings of $2.0M. - Workflow and Process Automation: The creation of the PRISM investment will directly result in increased productivity of OPP work staff through improved workflow processes and manual process automation. A benefit of PRISM's improved workflow and process automation will be evident through improved data entry accuracy, resulting in fewer errors in analysis and service response to both EPA and the community(Lifecycle savings $1,000,000). - Workload Capacity Enhancement: The automation of manual process will increase EPA's capacity to handle concurrent information and sudden surges in workload (Lifecycle savings $1,000,000). -Integration of systems: The processing efficiencies resulting from the change from a client server based system to PRISM will result in improved consistency across all applications resulting in simplified registration processes and access to registration results (Lifecycle savings $1,000,000). -Benefits to states and citizens: Lifecycle savings $1,000,000

Quantitative Benefits BY08
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Federal Quantitative Benefits

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Cost Avoidance
PY - 6 2000	0	0		
PY - 5 2001	0	0		
PY - 4 2002	0	0		
PY - 3 2003	0	0		
PY - 2 2004	0	0		
PY - 1 2005	0	0		
PY 2006	0	0		
CY 2007	0	0		
BY 2008	0	0		
BY + 1 2009	0	0		
BY + 2 2010	0	0		
BY + 3 2011	0	0		
BY + 4 2012	0	0		
BY + 5 2013	0	0		
BY + 6 2014	0	0		
BY + 7 2015	0	0		
BY + 8 2016	0	0		
Total LLC Benefit	0	0		

IV.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
What is the date of the risk management plan?	12/30/2006
Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No
If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:	
If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed?	
If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan?	
If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?	

Investment Risks BY08

Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

The PRISM project team evaluated investment risk against the OMB prescribed risk areas. Risk impacts, probabilities and costs were evaluated within the project plan and quantified through their analysis. The results of this analysis were utilized to adjust the investment schedule and budgetary request.

IV.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Earned Value BY08

You should also periodically be measuring the performance of operational assets against the baseline established during the planning or full acquisition phase (i.e., operational analysis), and be properly operating and maintaining the asset to maximize its useful life. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements.

Are you using EVM to manage this investment?	N/A
If "no," explain plans to implement EVM:	

Please provide a brief summary of the operational analysis results.

This sub-sections questions are NOT applicable for capital assets with ONLY O&M

Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government
EVMS "As of" date:	6/30/2006
What is the Planned Value (PV)?	
What is the Earned Value (EV)?	
What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?	
What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)?	
What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?	
What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?	
What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)?	

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748?	Yes

Cost/Schedule Variance BY08

Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)	No
If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?	
If "yes," explain the variance:	

If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?

What is the most current "Estimate at Completion"?

Performance Baseline BY08

Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past Yes
fiscal year?

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in $ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate 0 for any milestone no longer active.

If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?   08/31/2006

Answer the following questions about the status of this investment. Include information on all appropriate capital assets supporting this investment except for assets in which the performance information is reported in a separate exhibit 300.

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline (EGov)

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete	Agency Responsible For Activity
		Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (Estimated)	Completion Date		Total Cost		Schedule (# days)	Cost		
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual				
Project											